

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE 04/09/2001		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Elmar Peschke	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. 8721	
09/701,334				1348		
75	90	10/24/2003		EXAMINER		
Striker Striker 103 East Neck I		nby	CHISM, BILLY D			
Huntington, N		43		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
3 - 7				1654		

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/701,334	PESCHKE ET AL.	
narious rione	Examiner	Art Unit	
	B. Dell Chism	1654	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eith condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	er: (1) a timely filed amendm Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3	s application. A proper reply to ent which places the applicatio	n in
PERIOD FO	R REPLY [check either a) or	b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the maili	ng date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Tave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shop) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than the arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	extension and the corresponding amortened statutory period for reply originates	ount of the fee. The appropriate extensionally set in the final Office action; or (2) as	n fee under set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appe 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3) 			
2.☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter	red because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require	further consideration and/or s	search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see N	lote below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the applica issues for appeal; and/or	tion in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simpl	lifying th
(d) they present additional claims without ca	anceling a corresponding nun	nber of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3.⊠ Applicant's reply has overcome the following	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) we canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	vould be allowable if submitte	d in a separate, timely filed am	endmen
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ reque application in condition for allowance becaus		en considered but does NOT pl	ace the
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considere raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed S	OLELY to issues which were no	ewly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended clair			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as foll	ows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u>-</u>		
3. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a)□ approved or b)□	disapproved by the Examiner.	
		No(s)	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stat	ement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	140(3)	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for lacking enablement, is maintained in part. The application still lacks enablement for in vivo use, as was discussed via a telephonic conversation with Applicants' representative.

The Prior Art rejections are obviated by the Rule 131 affidavit, wherein Applicants swear back of the Peschke article, namely the article by Peschke et al., J. Peneal Res. 23, pp. 156-163 (1997). The rejection of claims 9-10 as anticipated by Bailey et al. (Hormone Res. 5:21-28) is obviated via amendment to cancel claims 9 and 10.



85